

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Butte)

----

In re W.D., Jr., a Person Coming Under  
the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

W.D., JR.,

Defendant,

W.D., SR.,

Appellant.

C062658

(Super. Ct. No.  
J29588)

In December 2008, Hazel Costa left her Ford Expedition idling in the driveway and entered her home. The truck was gone when she returned. She noticed that an "Avalanche" drove by, stopped in front of her house, and sped away moments later. Her wallet was found on a road later that morning, and the

Expedition was found a few blocks from her home. Two purses were missing from the truck.

Shortly thereafter, W.D., Jr. (the minor) was spotted driving a vehicle that had been reported stolen and that also matched the description given by Costa of the "Avalanche" that stopped in front of her house and then sped away. Two Highway Patrol units, with overhead lights and a siren, followed the minor, but the minor refused to stop. The minor fled, driving 60 to 70 miles per hour in a residential neighborhood, running at least four stop signs, and almost hitting several bicyclists and vehicles. The truck finally stopped when it struck a house. Costa's credit card was inside the stolen Explorer, and the minor had tools for entering a locked car.

In September 2008, at around 3:00 a.m., Cedar Hernandez saw two juveniles standing next to her Volvo, and a third juvenile sitting in the driver's seat. Moments later, the juveniles walked around the front of her apartment complex. A few music compact disks, a bag of makeup, and around six dollars were missing from her car. Three juveniles were detained across the street from the apartment complex. Hernandez identified the minor as one of the juveniles standing beside her car.

In January 2009, the People filed a petition to prosecute the minor as an adult. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 707.1.) Later that month, the People filed a subsequent petition charging the minor with three counts of unlawful driving or taking a vehicle (Veh. Code, § 10851, subd. (a)), felony evading an officer (Veh. Code, § 2800.2), felony receiving stolen property (Pen. Code,

§ 496, subd. (a)), misdemeanor possession of burglary tools (Pen. Code, § 466), misdemeanor prowling (Pen. Code, § 647, subd. (h)), and petty theft (Pen. Code, § 484, subd. (a)).

The juvenile court appointed counsel to represent the minor's father, W.D. (father), in January 2009. In March 2009, father moved for the appointment of a psychological expert, and made peremptory and for-cause challenges to the juvenile court. The juvenile court denied the motions.

The minor was declared fit for juvenile court in April 2009. Later that month, the juvenile court denied father's motions to admit documentary evidence and to dismiss the delinquency petition.

Following a contested jurisdictional hearing, the juvenile court sustained allegations that the minor committed two counts of unlawful driving or taking a vehicle, felony evading an officer, felony receiving stolen property, misdemeanor possession of burglary tools, and misdemeanor prowling.

The juvenile court continued the minor as a ward of the court, placed him on probation, and ordered out-of-home-placement. The juvenile court denied father's request for dual jurisdiction. Over father's objection, the minor was placed with the Rite of Passage program in Nevada.

Father appeals.

We appointed counsel to represent father on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks us to review the record and to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.)

Father was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from father. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to him.

The judgment is affirmed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
SCOTLAND, P. J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
SIMS, J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
BUTZ, J.